

CGPG-94/1-3
January 1994

Towards a unification of gravity and Yang-Mills theory

Subenoy Chakraborty^{†‡} and Peter Peldán^{†1}

[†]Center for Gravitational Physics and Geometry
The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA

[‡]Department of Mathematics
Jadavpur University, Calcutta-700032, India

Abstract

We introduce a gauge and diffeomorphism invariant theory on Yang-Mills phase space. The theory is well defined for an arbitrary gauge group with an invariant bilinear form, it contains only first class constraints, and the spacetime metric has a simple form in terms of the phase space variables. With gauge group $SO(3, C)$, the theory equals the Ashtekar formulation of gravity with a cosmological constant. For Lorentzian signature, the theory is complex, and we have not found any good reality conditions. In the Euclidean signature case, everything is real. In a weak field expansion around de Sitter spacetime, the theory is shown to give the conventional Yang-Mills theory to the lowest order in the fields.

PACS numbers: 04.60.+n, 04.50.+h, 04.20.Fy

¹Email address: peldan@phys.psu.edu

Comparing the two dominating Hamiltonian formulations of (3+1)-dimensional Einstein gravity; the ADM-formulation [1] and the Ashtekar formulation [2], it is quite clear that gravity in (3+1)-dimensions (and (2+1)-dimensions) seems to prefer the Yang-Mills phase-space compared to the geometrodynamical phase-space. This is mainly due to the fact that the constraints in the theory simplify a lot in the transition to the Ashtekar formulation. There is, however, an ugly spot in this otherwise very beautiful formulation: the need for complex fields and complicated reality conditions. The Ashtekar Hamiltonian for Einstein gravity is known to exist for (2+1)- and (3+1)-dimensional Lorentzian and Euclidean gravity, but it is only for the (3+1)-dimensional Lorentzian case (the theory we are most interested in) that we need complex fields!

Another "disadvantage" of the Ashtekar variables can be found in the matter couplings: although both scalar fields and spinor fields can be beautifully incorporated into the theory, the coupling to the spin-1 Yang-Mills fields destroys the simplicity of the constraints. See [3]. Either the coupling is non-polynomial or one has to rescale the pure gravity part of the Hamiltonian constraint by multiplying it with the determinant of the metric. Both choices will probably severely complicate the canonical quantization of this theory.

These three facts taken together – (1) gravity prefers the Yang-Mills phase-space, (2) the theory is complex, and (3) the coupling to spin-1 Yang-Mills fields does not seem natural – could indicate that there exists another underlying more beautiful theory. This would presumably be a real (non-complex) unified theory of gravity and Yang-Mills theory, for some gauge group G , such that, when the larger symmetry is broken down to $G \sim SO(3) \times G^{YM}$, the need for complex fields appears.

In this letter, we will describe a candidate theory for this unification. We have, however, not been able to find a real theory for the case of Lorentzian signature of the metric. Otherwise, the theory fulfills the requirements put on it so far: it is a diffeomorphism and gauge invariant theory valid for any gauge group which has a non-degenerate invariant bilinear form. Furthermore, our model reduces to conventional Einstein gravity with a cosmological constant if one uses the gauge group $SO(3, C)$, and in an expansion for weak fields around de-Sitter spacetime, the theory agrees with conventional Yang-Mills theory to lowest order.

Here is the Hamiltonian for the unified theory²:

$$\mathcal{H}_{tot} = N\mathcal{H} + N^a\mathcal{H}_a + \Lambda_i\mathcal{G}^i \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{H} := \frac{1}{4}\epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{ijk}(E^{di})E^{aj}E^{bk}(B^{ck} + \frac{2i\lambda}{3}E^{ck}) \approx 0 \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_a := \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{abc}E^{bi}B_i^c \approx 0 \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_i := \mathcal{D}_a E_i^a = \partial_a E_i^a + f_{ijk}A_a^j E^{ak} \approx 0 \quad (4)$$

The index-conventions are: $a, b, c, \dots$ are spatial indices on the three dimensional hypersurface, and $i, j, k, \dots$ are gauge-indices in the vector representation, and therefore take

²Compared to [4] and [6], the fields are rescaled as follows: $E^{ai} \rightarrow -iE^{ai}$, $A_{ai} \rightarrow iA_{ai}$, $F_{ab}^i \rightarrow iF_{ab}^i$

the values $1, 2, \dots, N$ where N is the dimension of the Lie-algebra. Gauge-indices are raised and lowered with an invariant bilinear form of the Lie-algebra (the "group-metric"), often conveniently chosen to be the Cartan-Killing form. The basic conjugate fields are A_{ai} and E^{bj} , which satisfy the fundamental Poisson bracket: $\{A_{ai}(x), E^{bj}(y)\} = \delta_a^b \delta_i^j \delta^3(x-y)$. A_{ai} is a gauge connection, and E^{ai} is often referred to as the "electric field". The other fields in the theory, N, N^a, Λ_i are Lagrange multiplier fields whose variations impose the constraints $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_a$ and $\mathcal{G}_i$. B^{ai} is the "magnetic field": $B^{ai} := \epsilon^{abc} F_{bc}^i = \epsilon^{abc} (2\partial_b A_c^i + f^i_{jk} A_b^j A_c^k)$, and λ is the cosmological constant.

The most important ingredient in this formulation is $\epsilon_{ijk}(E^{dl})$, which is defined as follows:

$$\epsilon_{ijk}(E^{dl}) := \frac{\epsilon_{abc} E_i^a E_j^b E_k^c}{\sqrt{\det(E^{dl} E_l^e)}} \quad (5)$$

It is a generalization of the three dimensional Levi-Civita symbol to higher dimensional Lie-algebras. If the gauge-group is chosen to be three dimensional, $\epsilon_{ijk}(E^{dl})$ just reduces to the normal Levi-Civita symbol, and the Hamiltonian (1) equals the Ashtekar Hamiltonian for gravity with a cosmological constant. Note that this ϵ_{ijk} needs a non-zero $\det(E^{ai} E_i^b)$ for its definition, or, using the result (6) below; ϵ_{ijk} is only well defined for non-degenerate metrics.

Now, before one can say that one has a well defined and consistent theory described by the Hamiltonian (1), one must check if the time evolution of the constraints vanishes weakly (in Dirac's terminology). And, when the total Hamiltonian is a linear combination of constraints, this corresponds to checking the constraint algebra. Since $\mathcal{G}_i$ is the well known Gauss law constraint, which is known to generate gauge transformations, and $\mathcal{H}_a$ is the vector constraint, which is known to generate spatial diffeomorphisms (modulo gauge transformations), it is an easy task to calculate all the Poisson brackets containing these two constraints. See e.g [4] for details. As long as all the constraints are gauge and diffeomorphism covariant, the Poisson brackets containing $\mathcal{G}_i$ and $\mathcal{H}_a$ will all weakly vanish. This is the case here. The only Poisson bracket left to calculate is thus $\{\mathcal{H}[N], \mathcal{H}[M]\}$. This calculation is a bit messy but it simplifies if one notes that the result must be anti-symmetric in N and M meaning that only the terms containing derivatives on these fields survive. Here is the result:

$$\{\mathcal{H}[N], \mathcal{H}[M]\} = \mathcal{H}_a [E^{ai} E_i^b (M \partial_b N - N \partial_b M)] \quad (6)$$

where the square brackets denote smearing over the hypersurface:

$\mathcal{H}[N] := \int_{\Sigma} d^3x N(x) \mathcal{H}(x)$. Thus, the constraint algebra closes, and the theory is complete and consistent, in this sense.

Now, according to Hojman et al. [5], the above Poisson bracket can be used to read off the spatial metric in the theory. It was shown in ref. [5] that in any canonical formulation of a diffeomorphism invariant theory, with a metric, the spatial metric on the hypersurface always appears as a structure function in the Poisson bracket above. This result was derived from a consistency requirement on the theory, so although, at this stage, we do not know the physical importance of this metric, it is the only consistent choice for a metric. For a more detailed discussion regarding this question, see [4]. Moreover, in ref. [5] it was also shown that the Poisson bracket between the spatial metric and the Hamiltonian constraint always gives the extrinsic curvature. And, with both the

spatial metric and the extrinsic curvature at hand, it is possible to reconstruct the entire spacetime metric:

$$\tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} = \sqrt{-g}g^{\alpha\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{N} & \frac{N^a}{N} \\ \frac{N^a}{N} & -NE^{ai}E_i^b - \frac{N^aN^b}{N} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

The fact that the spatial metric has such a simple form in terms of the phase space variables makes it rather easy to impose the Lorentzian signature condition on the theory. In ref. [6] another gauge group generalization of the Ashtekar Hamiltonian was given, but for that model, the metric had a very complicated dependence on the phase space variables, making it almost impossible to restrict the metric signature by imposing conditions on the basic fields. Here, Lorentzian signature corresponds to requiring $E^{ai}E_i^b$ to be negative definite.

It is at this stage one may start looking for a real theory. The need for complex fields for the pure gravity case can be found from the Lorentzian signature condition; for pure gravity, the gauge group is $SO(3, C)$ and the "group metric" is the positive definite δ_{ij} , which means that E^{ai} must become complex in order for $E^{ai}E_i^b$ to be negative definite. (If one from the beginning chooses the "group metric" to be $-\delta_{ij}$, the right hand side of (6) will change sign, and the implications of the signature condition are unaltered.) Now, by choosing a gauge group with an indefinite "group metric", such as e.g $SO(1, 3)$, one would naively believe that the signature condition could be taken care of without ever having to introduce complex fields. This, however, does not work. With a negative definite $E^{ai}E_i^b$, the generalized epsilon (5) becomes complex, so although the fields are taken to be real, the complexification of the theory is introduced by this epsilon. Then, one could try to rescale the Hamiltonian constraint $\mathcal{H}$ by multiplying with the denominator in (5). The result is that the right hand side of (6) changes so that the densitized spatial metric becomes $-\det(E^{ck}E_k^d)E^{ai}E_i^b$; a metric that by construction is negative definite (for real fields) and hence corresponds to Euclidean signature.

Thus, the conclusion from this failure must be that it is not possible to "uncomplexify" the theory by simply generalizing it to other gauge groups and then pick a group with an indefinite "group metric". However, this does not mean that the hope for finding a real unified theory is dead. It may be that the real theory only exist for a very special gauge group with some "fancy" feature. After all, that is what we really wants: the theory telling us what gauge group to choose. So far this is only speculations, what we can say at this stage is that the theory presented in this letter needs complex fields in the Lorentzian case. The Euclidean case is perfectly all right with real fields. It is given by (1) with the "i" removed from the Hamiltonian constraint.

At this point, we know that the theory described by (1) is gauge invariant (since the generator of gauge transformations $\mathcal{G}_i$ is a first class constraint), we know that the theory is diffeomorphism invariant (since it has a constraint algebra required for such a theory [5]) and we know that the densitized spacetime metric is given by (7). The question is then; what kind of physical interpretation can be given to this theory? We will now show that if we expand this theory to first order around de Sitter spacetime, the Hamiltonian will coincide with the normal Yang-Mills Hamiltonian.

The idea is to, in (1), use a gauge group which is a direct product of $SO(3, C)$ and an arbitrary Yang-Mills gauge group: $G^{tot} = SO(3, C) \times G^{YM}$. Then, we will expand the total

Hamiltonian for the unified theory (1) around the de Sitter solution, and keep only the lowest order terms. We will denote the gravitational $SO(3, C)$ gauge indices by $A, B, C, \dots$ and the Yang-Mills G^{YM} gauge indices by $I, J, K, \dots$. E.g $E^{ai} E_i^b = E^{aA} E_A^b + E^{aI} E_I^b$. To perform this expansion, we do not need to use the explicit de Sitter solution, it suffices to know that

$$B^{aA} = -\frac{2i\lambda}{3} E^{aA} \quad (8)$$

for the de Sitter solution, in terms of Ashtekar's variables [7]. We denote the exact solution by putting a bar on the fields, and the perturbations around it with lower case letters:

$$\begin{aligned} E^{aA} &= \bar{E}^{aA} + e^{aA} \\ E^{aI} &= \bar{E}^{aI} + e^{aI} = e^{aI} \\ B^{aA} &= \bar{B}^{aA} + b^{aA} = -\frac{2i\lambda}{3} \bar{E}^{aA} + b^{aA} \\ B^{aI} &= \bar{B}^{aI} + b^{aI} = b^{aI} \\ N &= \bar{N} + n \\ N^a &= \bar{N}^a + n^a = n^a \\ \Lambda_i &= \bar{\Lambda}_i + \lambda_i \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here, we have used (8) and the fact that the Yang-Mills fields vanishes in the de Sitter solution. We have also picked a coordinate-system where $\bar{N}^a = 0$. Now, weak-field expansion here means: $e_A^a \ll \bar{E}_A^a$, $b_A^a \ll \lambda \bar{E}_A^a$, $e^{aI} e_I^b \ll \bar{q}^{ab} := \bar{E}^{aA} \bar{E}_A^b$ and $e^{aI} b_I^b \ll \lambda \bar{E}^{aA} \bar{E}_A^b$. Since we are mainly interested in the Yang-Mills part, we do not write out the pure gravity perturbation (although, it is a straightforward task to use the above expansion to get the gravitational part as well):

$$\begin{aligned} N\mathcal{H} &= \bar{N}\mathcal{H}_{YM}^{(2)} + N\mathcal{H}_{GR} + \mathcal{O}(e^4, b^4, \dots) \\ N^a \mathcal{H}_a &= N^a \mathcal{H}_a^{GR} + \mathcal{O}(e^4, b^4, \dots) \\ \Lambda^i \mathcal{G}_i &= \lambda^I \mathcal{G}_I^{(2)YM} + \Lambda^A \mathcal{G}_A^{GR} + \mathcal{O}(e^4, b^4, \dots) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}\mathcal{H}_{YM}^{(2)} &= \frac{\bar{N}}{4} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\bar{q}^{ab}|}} (\epsilon_{abc} \epsilon_{def} \bar{q}^{ad} \bar{q}^{be} e^{cI} (b_I^f + \frac{2i\lambda}{3} e_I^f)) \\ \lambda^I \mathcal{G}_I^{(2)YM} &= \lambda^I \mathcal{D}_a e_I^a = \lambda^I (\partial_a e_I^a + f_{IJK} a_a^J e^{aK}) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and the $\mathcal{O}(e^4, b^4, \dots)$ term includes all the higher order terms. $|\bar{q}^{ab}|$ is the determinant of the spatial metric $\bar{q}^{ab}$. Now, compare the expressions in (11) to the conventional Yang-Mills total Hamiltonian on any fixed background [3], [8], [7]:

$$\mathcal{H}^{conv} = \frac{-N}{2\sqrt{-|q^{ab}|}} \epsilon_{abc} \epsilon_{def} q^{ad} q^{be} (e^{cI} e^{fI} + \frac{1}{4} b^{cI} b_I^f) + N^a \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{abc} e^{bI} b_I^c + \lambda^I \mathcal{D}_a e_I^a \quad (12)$$

Now, to get exact agreement, we perform a canonical transformation in the unified theory: $\tilde{e}^{aI} := e^{aI} - \frac{3i}{4\lambda} b^{aI}$, and a_{ai} unchanged. With this, (11) becomes:

$$\bar{N}\mathcal{H}_{YM}^{(2)} = \frac{-\bar{N}}{2\sqrt{-|\bar{q}^{ab}|}} \epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{def}\bar{q}^{ad}\bar{q}^{be} \left(\frac{\lambda}{3} \tilde{e}^{cI}\tilde{e}_I^f + \frac{3}{16\lambda} b^{cI}b_I^f \right) \quad (13)$$

So, we see that the physical Yang-Mills fields are:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{phys}^{aI} &= \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{3}} \tilde{e}^{aI} \\ b_{phys}^{aI} &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2\lambda}} b^{aI} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and that the unified theory (1) reproduces the conventional Yang-Mills theory to lowest order. This means that in a weak field expansion around de Sitter spacetime, the rescaled Yang-Mills fields (14) will be governed by the Yang-Mills equations of motion. For a $U(1)$ Yang-Mills field, we know that these equations of motion are Maxwell's equations which are very well experimentally confirmed. So the question is, for what energy scales does this unified theory predict significant corrections to the Maxwell's equations? For a very small λ (since λ has dimension inverse length square, we really mean; on length scales where $\lambda r^2 \ll 1$) we know that the de Sitter metric is approximately the Minkowski metric. So, $\bar{E}^{aA}\bar{E}_A^b \approx \delta^{ab}$ in cartesian coordinates. The weak field expansion is then good for

$$e_{phys}^{aI} e_{I,phys}^b \ll \frac{2\lambda}{3} \delta^{ab} \quad (15)$$

With an experimental upper bound on λ of $10^{-62} m^{-2}$ [9] this restricts the electric field to be much weaker than $10^{-3}V/m$! This seems to be a severe problem for this theory: it predicts large corrections to Maxwell's equations already for rather modest field strengths. Note however that the cosmological constant here really just is a representative for any slowly varying background energy density. This means that in an experiment in a lab here on earth we must include in λ all the contributions coming from e.g thermal energy. (In room temperate air, the heat energy-density is about $10^{-40} m^{-2}$ in natural units, which means that the restriction on the electric field increases to $10^8 V/m$.)

Another fact that makes the importance of the value of the cosmological constant unclear (in this context), is that in a coupling to a massive scalar or spinor field, the mass term normally looks like a cosmological constant term. This could mean that when e.g spinors are included, it is the spinor mass that becomes important instead of the cosmological constant.

Further work related to this unified theory can be found in [7], where the coupling to spinors and scalar fields are studied, as well as the static and spherically symmetric solution for gauge group $U(2)$. For related work in (2+1)-dimensions, see [10].

S.C is grateful to U.G.C (India) and Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES), for giving the opportunity to visit the Center for Gravitational Physics and Geometry, Penn State University. S.C's work was supported in part by the grant from

CIES, grant no. 17263. P.P's work was supported by the NFR (Sweden) contract no. F-PD 10070-300, and *Per Erik Lindahls Fond, Kungliga Vetenskapsakademien*.

References

- [1] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, *Gravitation: An introduction to current research*. (L. Witten, Ed.), (Wiley, New York, 1962).
- [2] A. Ashtekar, Phys. Rev. D **36** (1987) 1587.
- [3] A. Ashtekar, J.D. Romano and R.S. Tate, Phys. Rev. D **40** (1989) 2572.
- [4] P. Peldán, "Actions for gravity, with generalizations: A review." gr-qc/9305011, To appear in Class. Quant. Grav.
- [5] S. Hojman, K. Kuchař and C. Teitelboim, Ann. Phys., NY **96** (1976) 88.
- [6] P. Peldán, Phys. Rev. D **46** (1992) R2279.
- [7] S. Chakraborty and P. Peldán, work in preparation.
- [8] J. D. Romano, Gen. Rel. Grav. **25** (1993) 759.
- [9] *General Relativity, An Einstein Centenary Survey*, (S.W. Hawking and W. Israel, Ed.'s), (Cambridge University Press, 1979)
- [10] P. Peldán, Nucl. Phys. **B395** (1993) 239.